

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	F	ILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/683,988	09/683,988 03/08/2002		Thomas G. Braga	55295	2600	
21888	7590	08/06/2004		EXAMINER		
THOMPSO ONE US BA		,	JOHNSON, EDWARD M			
	SUITE 3500				PAPER NUMBER	
ST LOUIS,	MO 631	01	1754			

DATE MAILED: 08/06/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

W

	Application No.	Applicant(s)					
Office Action Summany	09/683,988	BRAGA ET AL.					
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit					
	Edward M. Johnson	1754					
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence ad	dress				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).							
Status							
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 Ju	ne 2004.						
2a) This action is FINAL . 2b) ⊠ This							
3) Since this application is in condition for allowan	ce except for formal matters, pro	secution as to the	merits is				
closed in accordance with the practice under E	x parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 45	3 O.G. 213.					
Disposition of Claims							
4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-9 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) 1-6 is/are withdrawn f 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 7-9 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or							
Application Papers	election requirement.						
 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acceed a Applicant may not request that any objection to the or Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner 	pted or b) objected to by the E Irawing(s) be held in abeyance. See on is required if the drawing(s) is obj	37 CFR 1.85(a). ected to. See 37 CF					
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119							
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 							
Attachment(s)							
Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 2/04,4/04.	4) Interview Summary (Paper No(s)/Mail Dal 5) Notice of Informal Pa 6) Other:	ie	-152)				

Art Unit: 1754

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

1. Applicant's election with traverse of claims 7-9 in the reply filed on 6/30/04 is acknowledged. The traversal is on the ground(s) that no separate search is required. This is not found persuasive because the Examiner specified a particular example of subclasses that would require separate searches for the separate claimed inventions. The searches do not necessarily encompass each other, as Applicant suggests, since they would not both be searched had only one of the inventions been claimed.

The requirement is still deemed proper and is therefore made FINAL.

Double Patenting

2. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See In re Goodman, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); In re Longi, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); In re Van Ornum, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); In re Vogel, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, In re Thorington, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Art Unit: 1754

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

- 3. Claims 7-8 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-3 of U.S. Patent No. 6,251,348.

 Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to claim a mixture of iron oxide/hydroxide and/or zinc oxide/hydroxide because the '348 patent claims iron oxide, zinc oxide, or combinations thereof (see claims 1-3).
- 4. Claim 9 is rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-3 of U.S. Patent No. '348 in view of Paull et al. US 4,014,982. It is considered that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to claim a mixture of manganese oxide, as disclosed in Paull, in place of the iron oxide in the compound of the sulfur removal process of Patent '348 because Paull discloses his manganese oxide for use in a compound for the removal of sulfur dioxide (abstract) to process large volumes of noxious industrial effluent efficiently without recycling impurities or

Art Unit: 1754

requiring addition of chemicals not inherent to the process (see column 3, lines 55-60).

Conclusion

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Edward M. Johnson whose telephone number is 571-272-1352. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9:30-6:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stanley S. Silverman can be reached on 571-272-1358. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Art Unit: 1754

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

all and

EMJ

Page 5